

UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD

MINUTES OF THE UTAH RADIATION CONTROL BOARD MEETING, October 3, 2003, held at the Moab Arts and Recreation Center, 111 East 100 North, Moab, Utah, at 9:00 – 11:00 a.m.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Karen S. Langley, M.S., Chair
Stephen T. Nelson, Ph.D., Vice Chair
William J. Sinclair, M.S.E.H., Executive Secretary
Keith C. Barnes, J.D.
Kent J. Bradford, P.G.
Thomas K. Chism, M.S.
Gary L. Edwards, M.S.
Linda M. Kruse, M.S.
Gregory G. Oman, D.D.S., B.S.
Robert S. Pattison, B.Sc.
John W. Thomson, M.D.
Gene D. White, Commissioner

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT/EXCUSED

Rod O. Julander, Ph.D.
Dianne R. Nielson, Ph.D., Dir. of DEQ

DRC STAFF/OTHER DEQ MEMBERS PRESENT

Dane Finerfrock, DRC Staff
Philip Griffin, DRC Staff
Craig Jones, Acting Director for DRC
Loren Morton, DRC Staff
Raymond Nelson, DRC Staff
Yoli Shropshire, DRC Staff

PUBLIC

Kenneth L. Alkema, Envirocare of Utah, Inc.
Sarah Fields, Sierra Club, Glen Canyon Group
Ron Hochstein, IUC (USA), President
Bill Love, Sierra Club
Toby Wright, DOE-Grand Junction Office
John Darke

GREETINGS/MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

The Utah Radiation Control Board convened at the Moab Arts and Recreation Center, 111 East 100 North, Moab, Utah. Karen S. Langley, Chair to the Board, called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. She welcomed all members and local Moab residents that were attending the meeting. Mrs. Langley stated to those present, if they wished to address any items on the agenda to indicate it on the public sheet as they signed-in. Those desiring to comment would be given a chance to address their concerns before the end of the Board Meeting.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Board action item)

a. Approval of September 5, 2003 Minutes

Karen Langley, Chair asked for corrections to the minutes of September 5, 2003, from Board Members. Gary L. Edwards asked for the following corrections to the transcript in the minutes:

1. Page 2, of the Transcript to Minutes, under Members of the Board Present, it reads that Gary L. Edwards was present. Change to read that Gary L. Edwards was absent.
2. Page 2, of the Transcript to Minutes, under Members of the Board Not Present, it reads that Gregory G. Oman was not present. Change to read that Gregory G. Oman was present.
3. Page 2, of the Transcript to Minutes, under Members of the Board Present, Stephen T. Nelson, noted that he came in very late to the meeting.

Gregory G. Oman asked for the following corrections to the minutes:

4. Page 3, of the minutes Item IV.a. paragraph five, third sentence which reads “Dr. Oman said that he did not want to see an increase and he said that his **colleges** would ask” Change to read, “. . . . **colleagues**”
5. On the handout of “Statement of the Executive Secretary,” Page 1, paragraph two, first sentence, under subtitle “Interpreting the definition of byproduct,” sentence which reads “If a major amendment is submitted to the Executive Secretary, the definition of byproduct **may** become an issue” Change to read “. . . **shall** become an issue”

Gary Edwards, made a motion to approve the minutes of September 5, 2003, with the above corrections, seconded by John Thomson.

CARRIED AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

II. RULES (Board action item)

a. Changes to R313-19, “Requirements of General Applicability to Licensing of Radioactive Material”, R313-21, “General Licenses”; and R313-22, “Specific Licenses”

Philip Griffin of the DRC staff provided the Board with information about proposed changes to the Utah Radiation Control Rules. A copy of the sections of the rules was included in the Board packet and he went over the text changes.

- R313-19-50 The changes to this rule change the edition date of an incorporated Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) regulation, and add information regarding the licensee's incident reporting requirements for special nuclear material. The latter change was identified by the NRC as an item of program compatibility.
- R313-21-21 The changes incorporate various text changes, including correcting typographical errors.
- R313-21-22 The major changes incorporate changes to the Division's General License program due to changes to NRC's program, and the need for Utah's program to be compatible with NRC's program. The minor changes incorporated various text changes.
- R313-22-35 New requirements were added to facilitate the review and processing of financial assurance methods.
- R313-22-75 The major changes incorporated changes to the Division's Specific License program for the licensees manufacturing and/or distributing devices under a General License. The changes to NRC's Licensing program necessitate the rule changes in order to keep Utah's program compatible with NRC's program. The minor changes incorporate various text changes.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Executive Secretary recommended that the Board approve the proposed changes to the Utah Radiation Control Rules, direct staff to file the changes for rulemaking, and direct staff to give notice to the public of a 30-day comment period.

Gary Edwards, made a motion that the changes be filed and that the DRC staff give notice to the public of a 30-day comment period, seconded by Kent Bradford.

CARRIED AND APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY

III. RADIOACTIVE MATERIALS LICENSING/INSPECTION (Board information item)

a. Results of IMPEP Management Review Board meeting

At the last Board meeting, Bill Sinclair advised the Board regarding the draft results of the performance evaluation of the Utah program. The NRC conducted the evaluation. He explained that on Thursday, September 25, 2003, a Management Review Board (MRB) meeting was held at NRC headquarters. Utah participated by videoconference with the MRB. In the draft MRB report, there were three recommendations:

- (1) Provide additional training for the staff in the policy regarding allegations investigation.
- (2) Recommended training be provided to the low-level waste staff.

- (3) Supervisory accompaniments be completed for the low-level waste staff.

As a result of discussions with the MRB, recommendations 1 and 2 were eliminated. Recommendation 1 was eliminated because the training had occurred between the IMPEP review and the MRB meeting. Recommendation 2 was eliminated because there are no standards for "recommended" training of low-level waste staff, it was also recognized that the low-level waste staff had completed core or required training as determined appropriate for the position description. It was also recommended that the sub-element, Technical Staffing and Training be changed from a recommendation of satisfactory with recommendations for improvement to satisfactory.

In summary, the Utah Radiation Control Program was found by the MRB to be satisfactory (the highest rating) in all common performance and non-common performance indicators and the program is adequate and compatible. The next program review will be scheduled in 2007.

IV. X-RAY REGISTRATION/INSPECTION (Board information item)

a. X-Ray Registration/Inspection fees discussion before the Board – next steps

Craig Jones summarized the information he presented to the Board at the meeting held on September 5, 2003. He told the Board that the Draft Fiscal Year 2005 Fee Schedule for the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) had been prepared and it contained fee increases for the x-ray registration and inspection program. The proposed increase was the one presented at the September meeting that was projected to recover 98% of the program costs.

Craig then outlined the opportunities the public has to provide comment on the Department's Draft Fee Schedule. He explained that the first opportunity begins when a newspaper notice is published on or about October 24, 2003. The notice will state that a 30-day period exists for the public to submit written comments to the Department of Environmental Quality. The notice will also state that a hearing will be held on or about November 25, 2003. Craig explained that any comments received will be reviewed, summarized for the Executive Director of DEQ, a Final Fee Schedule will be prepared with or without changes based on comments and input from Division Directors. The Final Fee Schedule is then sent to the Governor's Office and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst Office.

Craig said that the next opportunity for public input occurs during the 2004 Legislative Session when the Transportation, Environment and National Guard Appropriation Subcommittee meets to discuss the DEQ budget and Fee Schedule. Craig described the manner in which members of the public may provide comments to the subcommittee and the mechanism to be recognized by the Subcommittee Chairpersons. He then mentioned the Subcommittee might decide to change the Fee Schedule. After the Subcommittee has made a decision, Craig said that the Fee Schedule is sent to the Executive Appropriations Committee where the same opportunity for public input exists. Craig then summarized the process for placing all fee schedules into the Appropriations Bill.

There were some questions about the information Craig provided from Board Members as follows:

Gregory Oman asked Craig if he had said there was an increase of \$10 for dental fees and if this included other machines too? Craig responded that the \$10 inspection fee increase was applied to all categories of dental x-ray systems.

Bill Sinclair added that the Appropriations Subcommittee typically meets the first week of the session. The Legislature web site contains scheduling information for the various committees. He said that DEQ is usually the first department on the list for a budget review. During the first budget review meeting, the Subcommittee may give its tentative approval of the budget. Then about two to three weeks later, they will hold another meeting for a final approval. He said that this is really the time to look for, if individuals want to have an input on the process.

Gary Edwards asked Craig who the legislator was that had requested the changes, but Craig answered that he did not know. Gregory Oman also asked Craig who had requested the changes. Bill Sinclair answered that it was the Appropriations Subcommittee, the Co-Chairs. Bill said there are two Chairs, a House Representative and a Senate Representative.

Gary Edwards asked Bill Sinclair if he had seen this request being made of other programs as a way to reduce State general funds going to programs. Bill Sinclair answered yes.

Kent Bradford asked about the process to advise the affected public. He noted that some individuals do not review the public notice section of a newspaper. Craig replied that two days before a notice is published he plans to send a letter to a number of professional associations that represent users of x-ray systems.

Gregory Oman asked if anyone in the Division had been asked or was thinking about the time needed to test x-ray tubes. He asked if the inspection frequency could decrease. Craig answered that they did not consider this as part of the analysis to recover 100% of the program costs. Craig noted that if the inspection frequency were changed, then another analysis of the revenue impact would have to be performed.

John Thomson asked how the fee changes would affect linear accelerators, nuclear medicine facilities, MRIs, CAT-scans, and things of this nature. Craig answered the fee for registering a CT unit and a linear accelerator will increase from \$15 to \$35. He said that there are no increases for MRI systems and nuclear medicine facilities.

Gregory Oman asked Craig about the possibility of a direct notification of the proposed changes to persons affected by the changes. Craig answered that this issue will be considered.

V. RADIOACTIVE WASTE DISPOSAL (Board information items)

a. Envirocare NOVs

Dane Finerfrock provided the Board the following information on items a. and b.:

- (1) The first NOV was issued on March 5, 2003, for failure to close areas of open cell. A time limit is given in Part I.E.G. of Envirocare's Ground Water Quality Discharge Permit No. UGW4500051. The Permit has a requirement that after first disposal in an area, cell closure must be completed after four years. There were three areas that had not met this requirement.

The NOV has not yet been resolved, but DRC is currently meeting with Envirocare to resolve these issues. Envirocare has contested this NOV. If resolution goes beyond the agency, the matter will be heard before the Water Quality Board.

- (2) The second NOV was issued after an inspection conducted on August 7, 2003. There is a license condition license relating to a Site Radioactive Security Plan. Section 5.0 states that all hand and small power tools procured and used to perform operations activities by Envirocare employees or by any of Envirocare's contractors, within the Bulk Disposal Facility restricted areas, shall be uniquely identified and distinguishable from the tools delivered to the site for disposal.

Three or four years ago the licensee had a similar incident. As part of resolving that NOV, the Site Security Plan was implemented. Again, our inspector identified small hand power tools that were not clearly marked.

This NOV has now been resolved and is closed.

- (3) Another inspection was performed on July 23, 2003, which resulted in an NOV for failing to meet construction requirements as stated in the Construction Quality Assurance Quality Control Plan.

Envirocare uses a loose grout to fill void spaces within and around waste packages. In order for the loose grout to get into the packages, the packages must be breached in some way. Our inspectors identified a number of large packages where the breaching had not taken place.

Envirocare has been actively resolving this NOV. We expect this to be resolved within the next couple of weeks.

The first two NOVs were Severity Level IV violations, issued under the Radioactive Material License. The third NOV, issued under the Ground Water Discharge Permit, does not use a Severity Level scale.

b. Envirocare GW Discharge Permit Modification

Dane Finerfrock told the Board that Envirocare is currently modifying their Ground Water Discharge Permit. The current change is Modification No. 5. The modification is a redesign and reengineering of the cover system for the low activity radioactive waste cell (LARW).

Another major change in the Ground Water Discharge Permit was approval of a reduction in the amount of clay put on top of the waste. After analysis, it was found that the design Envirocare proposed 10 years ago did not add any protective factors to the cover system regarding precipitation infiltration or bio-intrusion into the cover.

Bill Sinclair provided the Board the following information:

c. Summary of meeting of the LLW Forum, September 22-23, 2003, Chicago, Illinois

Bill Sinclair indicated that he recently attended a meeting of the LLW Forum in Chicago. Some of the information highlights were: (1) Instead of starting repayment of funds to the Barnwell closure/post-closure fund, the legislature appropriated another 2.5 million representing interest earned from the account for the year. (2) In Washington, the legislature borrowed 13.8 million from the Richland closure/post-closure fund with repayment scheduled for 2008. (3) Duratek, operator of the Barnwell site, announced that the capacity for the site was almost sold out through 2007. For example, for FY04/05, the capacity limit is 50,000 cubic feet and Duratek has 896 cubic feet commitments. From year to year, the remaining capacity ranges from 178 cubic feet to 8,832 cubic feet. Duratek announced at the meeting it was advising its customers, by letter, that there is very little remaining space available. (4) EPA reported on an information gathering initiative on low activity waste that is to commence soon [awaiting a new Administrator]. (5) NRC reported that they have received 2500 comments on their initiative regarding clearance of solid materials. (6) The Texas site is moving forward. TCEQ is developing rules that will determine a successful applicant that can eventually operate a low-level compact site and a privately owned federal waste site. The Texas representative stated that low-level waste would be received only from the Texas Compact states of Maine, Vermont, and Texas and includes B/C waste. During the meeting, Duratek reported receiving 991 cubic feet from Texas during 2002-2003, they also projected that the current operational B/C waste volumes of 20,000 – 25,000 could be further reduced by instituting certain operational controls (e.g., change out of resins more frequently at power plants).

d. Summary of tours and public meetings of the Hazardous Waste Regulation and Tax Policy Task Force, September 18-19 and upcoming meeting on October 14, 2003

Bill Sinclair reported that the Legislative Hazardous Waste Regulation and Tax Policy Task Force recently conducted two additional public meetings, toured two facilities and received a briefing on a proposed facility. The public meetings were held in Price and Blanding. The facilities toured included East Carbon Development Corporation (ECDC), a municipal solid and industrial waste disposal facility, and International Uranium. The task force was also briefed on a new proposed municipal solid and industrial waste landfill to be located near Green River called the “Solitude Landfill.” Only a few members of the public

attended the Price hearing and several individuals attended the Blanding hearing. The task force is focusing its efforts to gather information regarding the operation, regulation, and safety of the various commercial facilities and the fees and taxes in place for such facilities. The next meeting of the task force is October 14, 2003 at the State Capitol. The morning will be devoted to a public hearing and the afternoon will be a discussion of next steps. Since this is a two-year task force, there have been indications that during 2004 the task force will look at the B/C low-level waste issue and the Compact issue.

VI. URANIUM MILL TAILINGS UPDATE (Board information items)

a. Activities at the White Mesa Mill – presentation by International Uranium Corporation

Ron Hochstein, IUC (USA), President updated the Board on the activities at IUC (USA) Inc., as follows:

- (1) Ron informed the Board that the last mill run was completed in May, 2003. After processing over 265,000 tons of alternate feed material from two mineral sites. There was a work force of 70 employees during this mill run with over 50% (percent) Native Americans employed.

There was no loss time for any accidents. This is exceptional since some of these employees have never had any experiences with the mining industry. Credit is given to the management staff at IUC and for the training that took place. Since the completion of the mill run, the workforce has been reduced to 15 employees and the mill continues to receive alternative feed material from the two sources.

The next anticipated mill run is the Spring of 2004. The mill will receive alternate feed material from CAMECO. Currently, IUC is fine-tuning the process flow that was used to process this type of material in 1998, and we hope to improve the operating cost.

- (2) Another project under way at the mill is the clean up of Cell A, which was built by UMETCO in 1998 and 1999. He said that this cell was never really put in operation and was only used to store process solutions. Over time, the solutions have crystallized. In addition, because the liner was left open to the sun, the liner above the crystals along the edge of the cell has degraded. As a result, the company is cleaning out the crystals from the location to prepare the cell for relining based on current design standards.
- (3) Ron Hochstein said that they also continue to pursue other alternate feed materials. Their hope is to extend the next mill run. With regard to the next mill run, a past issue of processing other site material and debris was discussed. He said that any disposal of debris to a cell occurred after a washing process.
- (4) In an inspection, finished in June and closed out in July, 2003, took place. The inspection involved a number of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspectors and two State inspectors. This inspection considered all aspects of the mill operations, the Radiation, Health and Safety Programs, and the Environmental Program. It was the only one in 2003.

During this inspection the mill received a Severity Level IV violation for failure to have a diagram of particular location. IUC had the documentation of the location of the material, but did not draw a diagram. A response to this NOV was sent to NRC on Wednesday, October 1, 2003 and a revised procedure has been approved and put in place.

Another inspection, in conjunction with the State, is planned for the fall of 2004.

- (5) With regard to the chloroform contamination, in April, 2003, IUC pumped the chloroform-contaminated water. Currently, IUC is pumping from three wells that have the highest concentration. Ron said that the chloroform contamination is the result of activities at the mill site prior to mill operation. Based on the most recent sampling results, received the week of the Board meeting, the chloroform concentrations have decreased across all 24-wells as a result of the pumping. Ron noted that IUC continues to work with the State on the Ground Water Discharge Permit for the Mill.
- (6) On other issues, IUC recently awarded six scholarships. Two were awarded to students in the Blanding School District and four were awarded to students from the White Mesa Mill Community. Mr. Hochstein also said that the Legislative Task Force was at the mill last week. Finally, on the Urizon Project, which was presented to the Board a couple of months ago, IUC is working with the State and NRC and the coordination of the regulatory approval process through this transition period from NRC regulation to Agreement State regulation. IUC is continuing to work through this transition. He said that the Urizon Project with respect to the U.S. Department of Energy is still under review.

b. Moab Tailings Update by Loren Morton

Date	Activity/Description
Moab Uranium Mill Tailings Project, Near Moab, Utah	
<i>Past Activities</i>	
July 28 thru August 4, 2003	<p>Drilling activities and nested groundwater monitoring wells were installed at three (3) drill sites inside the Matheson Preserve. From this field work, several preliminary observations were made, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Thick sequences of Colorado River deposited sands and gravels found at the east and north sides of the Matheson Preserve (BL-1 and BL-2), that were found to extend to depths of greater than 150 and 160 feet below ground surface (ft bgs), respectively. Of these two (2) sites, BL-1 had a greater proportion of coarse gravels. 2. A thinner section of sand with minor layers of River deposited gravels were found at the western well nest site, BL-3. Here, the Paradox Formation bedrock (caprock) was found at a relatively shallow depth, about 98 ft bgs. 3. Three (3) nested wells installed at each site for a total of nine (9) piezometers. Eight (8) successfully developed and sampled. 4. Upward hydraulic gradients found at all three (3) Matheson Preserve well nest sites. Stronger upward gradients found near the river (BL-2 and BL-3). However, these gradients turned horizontal in the shallow reaches of the aquifer near the silt/sand – gravel interface (~ 20 ft bgs at BL-2 / N-11 sites).

Date	Activity/Description
	<p>5. Field measurements of dissolved gas pressure found elevated levels in all eight (8) groundwater samples at the Matheson Preserve, ranging from 834 – 1,328 mm Hg. For comparison, barometric pressure in Moab was about 659 mm Hg (8/1/03). Lab analysis shows these gases are common atmospheric gases. The elevated pressures indicate that the groundwater was fresh at the time of recharge into the aquifer (“salting-out” effect upon contact with Paradox Formation).</p> <p>6. Low NH₃-N concentrations (1.5 to 4.6 mg/l) were found at all vertical intervals in all three (3) nested well sites in the Matheson Preserve (BL-1, BL-2, and BL-3). The highest NH₃-N concentration (4.6 mg/l) was found in BL-3-D (~ 98 ft bgs). All these concentrations are LESS than the Utah GWQS, 25 mg/l. <i>NOTE: additional lab work (N-15) needs to be done to determine if any of these NH₃-N values represent pollution from the Moab Tailings site.</i></p> <p>7. Highest uranium concentration (110 ug/l) found in Matheson Preserve well CR1-3, located on the south bank of the river. The State GWQS = 30 ug/l. This may indicate that mill site contamination has traveled under the river at this location. Additional confirmation sampling and study needs to be done.</p> <p>Laboratory analysis work continues. Additional University of Utah findings may be made later.</p>
July 30 thru August 1, 2003	<p>Groundwater samples collected from 10 selected DOE wells to analyze for: dissolved gases, oxygen-18, deuterium, nitrogen-15, tritium. Preliminary observations are as follows:</p> <p>1. Dissolved Gases - field measurements showed elevated concentrations of dissolved gases in seven (7) wells, which ranged from 758 to >1,825 mm Hg. Three (3) other wells found with dissolved gases ranging from 643 to 671 mm Hg. Interpretation here same as Matheson Preserve wells.</p> <p>2. High NH₃-N concentrations found on the DOE side of the river. In one case at well nest SMI-PZ1, these concentrations ranged from 418 mg/l (S) to 1,240 mg/l (M) to 2,100 mg/l (D), at depths of about 16, 57, and 72 ft bgs, respectively. Important to note that these concentrations are ORDERS of magnitude HIGHER than those seen at the Matheson Preserve.</p> <p>3. Low NH₃-N concentrations (~ 5 mg/l) seen at greater depths at DOE site in well nest ATP-1. All nested wells showed low concentrations (143, 224, 303, and 389.5 ft bgs). Base of NH₃-N plume appears to be between 72 and 143 ft bgs.</p> <p>Laboratory analysis work continues. Additional University of Utah findings may be made later.</p>
Future Activities	
November 1, 2003	Draft project report from Dr. Solomon to be submitted. Final report to be delivered later.
November 20, 2003	Combined DOE Cooperators and Moab Tailings Stakeholders Meeting in Moab to present latest information on groundwater/contaminant transport modeling and predictions for groundwater cleanup. Location and time to be determined soon.

Date	Activity/Description
<u>New</u>	<p><u>Revised DOE EIS Schedule</u> – provided by DOE-GJO staff this week, as follows:</p> <p>December 1, 2003 – draft EIS to Cooperators (start of 45-day review/comment period)</p> <p>January 16, 2004 – Cooperators comments due to DOE-GJO</p> <p>May 3, 2004 – Draft EIS available to public (starts 45-day comment period)</p> <p>June 14, 2004 – End of public comment period</p> <p>November 11, 2004 – Notice of Availability for Final EIS to be published</p> <p>December 20, 2004 – Record of Decision to be published in Federal Register</p>

c. Amended Agreement Update

Bill Sinclair informed the Board that the public comment period closed on September 25th on the issue of Utah's use of an alternate ground water standard for uranium mills. The next step in the amended Agreement process is for publication of the NRC's assessment of the application submitted by the Division that provides information to demonstrate that Utah could administer a program equivalent to the NRC. The expectation for publication is the October – November 2003 timeframe.

Sarah Fields informed the Board that the NRC has decided to extend the public comment period for 30 days by republishing a notice in the Federal Register. The notice will clarify the proceeding and make available certain documentation electronically. Bill indicated he was unaware of this decision by the NRC. (Note: Bill Sinclair checked with the NRC on his return from Moab and discovered that Sarah was correct in her statement regarding the extension of the comment period).

VII. Other Department Issues (Board information item)

a. Update of Division Director/Executive Secretary recruitment

Bill Sinclair indicated that Dianne Nielson would like to thank the Radiation Control Board members that have participated in the recruitment process to this point and she appreciates their patience in trying to schedule the remaining interviews. Bill indicated that Dianne has been involved with information gathering efforts in support of Governor Leavitt's nomination to be the next EPA administrator, which has slightly delayed the process. Hopefully, at the next Board meeting (November 7th), a name will be proposed as the next Executive Secretary for Board confirmation.

VIII. PUBLIC COMMENT

Public Participation by Local Residents:

Sarah Fields discussed a petition she submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. She challenged certain procedures that had been used in the staff assessment of Utah's proposed alternate standard to use Utah existing ground water regulations in lieu of the NRC regulations. She indicated that the NRC has agreed to an extension of the public comment period in response to her concerns. She also discussed the proposal by International Uranium regarding USM Ore and her understanding of the perspective of the Department of Energy in evaluating

the proposal. Sarah also mentioned a Congressional effort to clarify the classification of uranium mill tailings waste from the Fernald, Ohio site.

Bill Love questioned the status of the Texas effort to site a new low-level waste facility. Bill Sinclair provided an update.

John Darke commented on whether or not the Board should allow public comment at the time of an issue or wait until the appointed time on the agenda. He also pointed out that once Utah receives authority to administer the uranium mill program that it should be for the long term. He gave the example of the state of New Mexico who gained authority for the program and then returned it to NRC after a period of time.

OTHER ISSUES

- a. **Next Board Meeting – November 7, 2003, 2:00 p.m., Department of Environmental Quality, Building 2, Conference Room 101, 168 North 1950 West, Salt Lake City, Utah.**

The Board meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m.